

APPLICANT(S): A. RIBAK, et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/695,972
FILED: October 29, 2003.
Page 3

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 26 2008

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 – 14 and 26 – 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 “because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.”

Claims 1 – 14 and 26 – 36 have been cancelled without prejudice and accordingly their rejection is now moot.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 2 – 14, 16 – 23 and 27 – 34 “under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.” Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

Claims 2 – 14 and 27 – 34 have been cancelled without prejudice and accordingly their rejection is now moot.

Claims 16 – 18 and 21 have been amended to conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments bring all of claims 16 – 23 into compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and accordingly request that this rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 15, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Ruths et al. (*US Patent Publication No. 2003/0018719*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 26 have been cancelled without prejudice and accordingly their rejection is now moot.

APPLICANT(S): A. RIBAK, et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/695,972
FILED: October 29, 2003
Page 4

In order to move the prosecution forward, Applicants will also discuss new claims 37 – ?? with respect to Ruths et al.

- Ruths et al discloses a method and system to provide collaboration between applications such as distance learning, on line gaming, medical imaging, enterprise applications, business to business applications, internet publishing (paragraph 0009), graphical presentation applications, spreadsheet applications, and database applications (Paragraph 0083). These applications are not analogous to an IDE because:
 - They are end user applications; an IDE is intended for a different market: *developers*, not *users*.
 - They are a collection of independent standalone programs; an IDE is an *integrated environment* comprising a number of applications and tools in an integrated suite.
- The peer support taught by the present application is not, by definition, restricted to a collaborative effort. The peer support is provided by entities that do not necessarily have any responsibility or authority vis-à-vis the development task.
- the peer support of the present invention is in the form of teaching, not of collaboration and thus, it does not receive any state changes from other collaborators. – Ruths provides a platform to edit collaborative resources. The present invention does not allow anyone to touch the code other than the programmer. The present invention just wants thoughts from the peers of how to solve a particular problem. (para 20 of the present application – "may provide the ability to post questions to appropriate potential advisors" – nowhere does it allow the advisors to edit our code).
- In the present specification, "collaboration".is "electronic communication". by Ruths, collaboration means a shared project.

APPLICANT(S): A. RIBAK, et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/695,972
FILED: October 29, 2003
Page 5

Accordingly, Applicants assert that Ruths cannot provide the limitations of claims 15 and 37.